RD AN No. <u>3583</u> (1980-D) October 30, 2000

TO: All State Directors Rural Development

ATTENTION: Rural Housing Program Directors and

Guaranteed Rural Housing Coordinators

FROM: James C. Kearney (Signed by James C. Kearney)

Administrator

Rural Housing Service

SUBJECT: Guaranteed Rural Housing (GRH)

Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program (SFHGLP)

GRH Approved Lender Underwriting Guidelines

PURPOSE/INTENDED OUTCOME:

The purpose of this AN is to renew Agency methodology for evaluating "payment shock." The intended outcome of this AN is to provide underwriting guidance to SFHGLP lenders. It is the Agency's expectation that lenders will act responsibly when originating and underwriting loans under RD Instruction 1980-D.

COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS AN:

This AN replaces and is substantially similar to AN No. 3490 released on October 20, 1999.

BACKGROUND:

Our first year delinquency analysis continues to indicate that payment shock is a delinquency factor when other risk layering is present. The presence of payment shock is especially telling when the borrower's credit history contains derogatory information. Aside from our internal

EXPIRATION DATE: FILING INSTRUCTIONS:
November 30, 2001 Preceding RD Instruction 1980-D

study, our findings are supported by numerous observations from the State Offices as well as a major study by one of our largest nationwide approved lenders.

The term "payment shock" signifies the increase in housing expenses experienced by a borrower. Payment shock is defined as a percentage under the following formula:

(New Principal Interest Taxes and Insurance (PITI) ÷ Previous Housing Expense) - 1

The following three examples illustrate payment shock as a percentage:

- A. The borrower's new PITI is \$187.00 and their former rent was \$100.00. $187.00 \div 100.00 = 1.87$; 1.87 1 = .87; .87 = 87 percent The payment shock in this example is 87 percent.
- B. The borrower's new PITI is \$345.00 and their former rent was \$150.00. $345.00 \div 150.00 = 2.30$; 2.30 1 = 1.30; 1.30 = 130 percent The payment shock in this example is 130 percent.
- C. The borrower's new PITI is \$2,000.00 and their former rent \$1,000.00 $2,000.00 \div 1,000.00 = 2.00$; 2.00 1 = 1.00; 1.00 = 100 percent The payment shock in this example is 100 percent.

In cases where the borrower did not have prior housing expenses prior to purchasing a home, such as if the borrower was living with relatives, payment shock cannot be measured as a percentage.

IMPLEMENTATION RESPONSIBILITIES:

When conducting an underwriting analysis, lenders should be sure that:

- An applicant's credit history indicates a reasonable ability and willingness to meet obligations as they become due. If the lender grants an adverse credit waiver, they should properly document that the applicant's adverse circumstances were of a temporary nature beyond the applicant's control and have been removed, or that the delinquency was the result of a justifiable dispute relating to defective goods or services. See RD Instruction 1980.345(d).
- The applicant has adequate repayment ability and a history of dependable, available income to support their credit obligations, including the contemplated extension of credit. Cosigned obligations and contingent liabilities should be evaluated with care under RD Instruction 1980.345(c).

• The real property securing the loan must meet all Agency standards including property standards, appraisal standards, thermal requirements, and those pertaining to water and waste disposal systems (see RD Instruction 1980.313). It is imperative that lender underwriters carefully evaluate the condition of a property offered as collateral under the SFHGLP.

In cases where payment shock is 100 percent or higher as well as in cases where the applicant did not have housing expenses prior to purchasing a home, no additional risk layering (i.e. adverse credit waivers, debt ratio waivers, or buydowns) should be allowed without strong compensating factors. Acceptable compensating factors include, but are not limited to, the following examples:

- The borrower has an excellent credit history reflecting timely repayment of credit obligations;
- The borrower has a Fair Issacs & Company (FICO) credit score of 660 or greater. A FICO score of 660 or greater is a residential mortgage industry standard that is indicative of low default probability. Ongoing review of current and delinquent SFHGLP loans has demonstrated the validity of FICO scores as a tool. The credit score itself is derived only from information pulled from a borrower's credit report.
- The borrower has demonstrated a conservative attitude toward the use of credit and an ability to accumulate savings;
- The borrower has a stable employment history over the past two years, demonstrating a dependable income stream;
- The borrower has potential for increased earnings, as indicated by job training or education in the borrower's profession.

Approved lenders should be trained by Agency staff on GRH loan program underwriting guidelines; training should be offered to lenders on an ongoing basis. Lenders are expected to document their underwriting analyses and decisions. When submitting a loan package to the Agency for approval, lenders should provide evidence that an underwriter has reviewed and approved the file. The lender that is requesting the Conditional Commitment from the Agency is responsible for underwriting the loan.

Although the Agency is not responsible for underwriting individual GRH loans, approved lenders should be periodically monitored for GRH loan program underwriting compliance. Existing lenders with incidences of high first year delinquencies or high loan losses should be

subjected to quality control reviews to ensure that Agency underwriting standards are being adhered to. Newly approved lenders should have their underwriting reviewed based on the criteria outlined in RD Instruction 1980.309(g)(1).

State Offices having questions regarding this AN should contact Joaquín Tremols at (202) 720-1465 or jtremols@rdmail.rural.usda.gov.